

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Case No. 12-12020-mg

- - - - -x

In the Matter of:

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, et al.,

Debtors.

- - - - -x

United States Bankruptcy Court

One Bowling Green

New York, New York

July 30, 2012

3:03 PM

B E F O R E:

HON. MARTIN GLENN

U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

1

2 Status Conference RE: Hearing RE: Sale Order (CC: Doc no.  
3 538, 291, 292)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 Transcribed by: Penina Wolicki

21 eScribers, LLC

22 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607

23 New York, NY 10040

24 (973)406-2250

25 operations@escribers.net

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A P P E A R A N C E S :

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

Attorneys for Debtors  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10104

BY: ANTHONY PRINCI, ESQ.  
JAMIE LEVITT, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)

KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP

Attorneys for Official Creditors' Committee  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

BY: KENNETH H. ECKSTEIN, ESQ.  
PHILIP BENTLEY, ESQ.  
STEPHEN D. ZIDE, ESQ.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

Attorneys for Ally Financial Inc. & Ally Bank  
601 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

BY: RAY C. SCHROCK, ESQ.

SEWARD & KISSEL, LLP

Attorneys for U.S. Bank N.A. as Securitization Trustee  
One Battery Park Plaza  
New York, NY 10004

BY: ARLENE R. ALVES, ESQ.

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

Attorneys for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.  
90 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10016

BY: MICHAEL E. JOHNSON, ESQ.  
MARTIN G. BUNIN, ESQ.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

Attorneys for Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.

One Atlantic Center

1201 West Peachtree Street

Atlanta, GA 30309

BY: JOHN C. (KIT) WEITNAUER, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)

ROPES & GRAY LLP

Attorneys for RMBS Certificate Holders

1211 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10036

BY: KEITH H. WOFFORD, ESQ.

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Attorneys for Deutsche Bank

101 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10178

BY: JAMES L. GARRITY, JR., ESQ.

1 WHITE & CASE LLP

2 Attorneys for Junior Secured Noteholders

3 1155 Avenue of the Americas

4 New York, NY 10036

5

6 BY: J. CHRISTOPHER SHORE, ESQ.

7 HARRISON DENMAN, ESQ.

8

9

10 TALCOTT FRANKLIN P.C.

11 Attorney for Talcott Investors

12 208 N. Market Street

13 Suite 200

14 Dallas, TX 75202

15

16 BY: TALCOTT J. FRANKLIN, ESQ.

17

18

19 CARTER LEDYARD & MILBURN LLP

20 Attorneys for Talcott Investors

21 2 Wall Street

22 New York, NY 10005

23

24 BY: AARON R. CAHN, ESQ.

25 BRYCE C. BERNARDS, ESQ.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

DECHERT LLP

Attorneys for Bank of New York Mellon  
1095 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036

BY: GLENN E. SIEGEL, ESQ.

SIDLEY AUSTIN

Attorneys for Nationstar Mortgage  
One South Dearborn  
Chicago, IL 60603

BY: JESSICA BOELTER, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)  
LARRY NYHAN, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)

MCKOOL SMITH

Attorneys for Freddie Mac  
600 Travis Street  
Suite 7000  
Houston, TX 77002

BY: PAUL D MOAK, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

JACKSON WALKER, L.L.P.

Attorneys for Frost Bank

100 Congress Avenue

Suite 1100

Austin, TX 78701

BY: PATRICIA TOMASCO, ESQ. (TELEPHONICALLY)



RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

9

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT: Please be seated. We're here in  
3 Residential Capital, number 12-12020. Mr. Princi?

4 MR. PRINCI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Your Honor,  
5 I want to start with a housekeeping item. My office had, I  
6 believe, e-mailed to chambers a document that the parties have  
7 a copy of that I wanted to hand to the Court to use today to  
8 assist us in walking the Court through the proposed order that  
9 we submitted on Friday. I don't know if that --

10 THE COURT: Is this the summary of deadlines?

11 MR. PRINCI: It is, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: I was just handed it a few minutes ago.

13 MR. PRINCI: Okay. Would anybody like additional  
14 copies, because I have additional copies. Would any of your  
15 clerks like?

16 Okay, well, Judge, before I jump in, let me frame this  
17 for the Court. Obviously, at the last hearing there was  
18 consternation by the Court and by the parties about the state  
19 of affairs that we were in with respect to the then  
20 disagreement amongst the parties regarding a scheduling order.  
21 Judge, I'm happy to report, as you saw on Friday, that the main  
22 parties have agreed to a single order. And that came about,  
23 Your Honor, as a result of the very cooperative efforts by all  
24 the parties, and in particular, Mr. Siegel and the rest of the  
25 counsel for the trustees; Ms. Patrick and her team, on behalf

1 of the institutional investors; and the Kramer Levin team, on  
2 behalf of the committee. So I want to thank them for their  
3 cooperation.

4 I'm also happy to report, Your Honor, that we learned  
5 a short while ago that Nationstar's lenders have consented to  
6 the requested two-week adjournment to the sale hearing. So  
7 that now goes from November 5th to November 19th. And I'll get  
8 to that when I walk you through the order. But with that, Your  
9 Honor, if you will, the overhang to whether or not this was  
10 truly firm is now gone. And I want to extend my thanks to the  
11 Sidley firm for their efforts in expediting that consent, Your  
12 Honor.

13 Your Honor, I know that you haven't had a long time to  
14 review the proposed order. But what I thought I would do  
15 today, subject to how Your Honor would like to handle this, is  
16 maybe start by at least explaining to the Court what it is that  
17 we have tried to accomplish, and then mechanically, how we  
18 believe, hopefully, we've gotten there, and then, of course,  
19 take the Court's questions, if that's okay with the Court?

20 THE COURT: That's fine. Go ahead.

21 MR. PRINCI: Okay. So, Judge, I think there are a few  
22 things that we have tackled and that are covered by this order.  
23 And let me get through the whereas clauses, the main purpose of  
24 which, as Your Honor can see by reviewing the document, really  
25 would provide the framework and the definitions that are

1 necessary later on.

2 But the first part, Your Honor, really is the sort of  
3 guts of the schedule. Those are -- and that additional sheet  
4 we gave you, Your Honor, if you take a look, what we've done in  
5 that summary of deadlines is really just to extract from this  
6 order what, now, the dates are that are either going to be  
7 subject to the Court's calendar, but more importantly, with  
8 respect to the parties, they're deadlines for the parties to  
9 commit to certain requirements under this order; mostly pre-  
10 trial in nature.

11 And let me give you the highlights, Judge. I think  
12 you could see that we have a commencement for fact discovery.  
13 The reality is, Judge, that we've actually already begun that.  
14 But I think the first sort of main line of demarcation  
15 thereafter is on page 5, paragraph 7. And there you'll see,  
16 Judge, that that's the date by which any party, with the  
17 exception of the creditors' committee and the RMBS trustees,  
18 has to file an objection to the 9019 motion, if they have one.  
19 And that's October 5th.

20 And we all agree -- and obviously, Your Honor, the  
21 creditors' committee in particular, is looking out for the  
22 other creditors in the case, as the debtor. We all believe,  
23 Your Honor, that October 5th certainly gives all parties in  
24 this case enough time to determine whether they want to object  
25 to this order.

1           The reason, Your Honor, as you go forward, that you'll  
2 see we have on page 6, paragraph 10, a separate deadline for  
3 the committee and for the RMBS trustees, for October 15th, is  
4 they're just going to be undertaking a greater review, and Your  
5 Honor, appreciates that, I'm sure. So what we've done in order  
6 to make this schedule work for everybody -- and it is  
7 relatively truncated with respect to the amount of work people  
8 have to do -- we've provided to the committee and to the RMBS  
9 trustees, October 15th, for those parties to file any objection  
10 they have.

11           I think the next important date, Judge, that follows  
12 is in paragraph 13 on page 6, and that's the hearing date. So  
13 we've settled on November 5th as the hearing date for the  
14 present 9019 motion.

15           Thereafter, Judge, paragraph 14 on page 6; that  
16 provides, Your Honor, that the RMBS trustees -- now bear in  
17 mind, Your Honor, the Court will have heard the matter on  
18 November 5th. And after the Court has an opportunity to  
19 consider the evidence and make its decision, obviously a  
20 decision will be rendered by the Court. And the thinking,  
21 Judge, is that obviously that is a decision that the RMBS  
22 trustees are going to consider with considerable weight in  
23 terms of making their ultimate determination. By that point  
24 they will be well along their way, though, Judge, to having an  
25 independent position with respect to this matter.

1 And in terms of their having to make the decision  
2 whether or not to opt in, if the Court grants the motion, then  
3 the trustees have to opt in on the later of either November  
4 12th or five business days after the Court enters an order  
5 approving the 9019 motion.

6 So what I'd like to do, Your Honor, is pause there,  
7 because the next two sections get into somewhat different  
8 matters, although this is all integrated. But let me just  
9 pause there and see with respect to that pre-trial schedule and  
10 that hearing date, if the Court has any questions?

11 THE COURT: Give me a second, Mr. Princi.

12 MR. PRINCI: Sure.

13 THE COURT: And I did go through the order before.

14 (Pause)

15 THE COURT: I understand -- I certainly understand the  
16 rationale for different objection dates for the committee and  
17 the RMBS trustees versus other objectors. Do you know, at this  
18 point -- I mean, do you have indications at this point, who the  
19 other potential objectors are?

20 MR. PRINCI: Certainly, Your Honor, we've had  
21 discovery requests from MBIA and from FGIC two of the  
22 monolines. We've had a meeting with Assured, a third monoline.  
23 I can't say, Your Honor, what ultimately their intentions will  
24 be. But when one files discovery requests this early on,  
25 that's a possibility.

1 THE COURT: One question or concern I have is you have  
2 their objection, the other potential objectors' deadline for  
3 filing their objections, before the close of discovery. And I  
4 don't know whether I'm going to hear these last-minute requests  
5 to move their objection deadline, because discovery hasn't been  
6 closed.

7 MR. PRINCI: Judge, that is a -- I really think this  
8 schedule works relatively conventionally. I think that's  
9 probably the one area where it's somewhat unconventional. We  
10 worked a long time trying to figure out how to deal with this.  
11 That was the best we could do.

12 I would say the following, Judge. Number one, just by  
13 way of further background for the Court, another reason why we  
14 wanted to stagger those two deadlines, Judge, is one of the  
15 things that will be presumably be helpful to the RMBS trustees  
16 is to learn whether there are any other parties that file an  
17 objection and what those parties have to say they believe are  
18 the infirmities, if you will, with respect to the 9019 motion.

19 I think, Judge, that we tried to button this up as  
20 tightly as we could. I can't say to you that it is not  
21 possible that somebody might come in and have an issue with  
22 that. But I will say this: this proposed order is on notice  
23 to the parties that have the interest. For example, MBIA, Your  
24 Honor, was part of the discussions that we had. They were  
25 present throughout all of these discussions that led to this

1 proposed order. I don't know whether they're here today; I  
2 haven't looked. But it seems to me, Judge, that to the extent  
3 that we don't hear an objection at this point to the way that's  
4 staggered, I wouldn't think that somebody is likely to cause a  
5 problem with this.

6 THE COURT: Well, I see the close of fact discovery is  
7 September 24th. So that's before anybody's objection deadline,  
8 under this proposed schedule.

9 MR. PRINCI: Correct. Keep in mind, Judge, if you  
10 take a look at paragraph 6 on page 5; the debtors have an  
11 obligation, Judge, to file any supplemental expert reports by  
12 September 24. So any party in this case, Judge, is not going  
13 to be blindsided.

14 THE COURT: Okay.

15 MR. PRINCI: All we're really doing, Judge, is just  
16 giving the committee and the RMBS an additional grace. But we  
17 don't believe, Judge, in any way, shape, or form, we're  
18 inhibiting or taking away anything from any other party.

19 Judge, if Your Honor doesn't have any further  
20 questions --

21 THE COURT: Let me just -- go ahead.

22 MR. PRINCI: Okay. So, Judge, the other two sets of  
23 ordering provisions have to do with the following. And this  
24 was --

25 THE COURT: Those were the ones -- you're getting into

1 the area where I was less clear about what it is that the  
2 parties are agreeing to.

3 MR. PRINCI: And that's understandable. And that's  
4 sort of a cat's cradle of definitions. And that's why we tried  
5 to set aside a glossary, at least for easy reference, if not  
6 that it makes it that much easier to understand. But let me  
7 first tell you what the parties are trying to achieve with  
8 these two sets of ordering provisions.

9 What we have, Judge, is a situation where the trustees  
10 are in the unfortunate position of potentially facing a sales  
11 motion where, if they knew they were going to be ultimately  
12 objecting to the 9019 motion, they might otherwise want to  
13 assert certain objections to the sale motion. But on the other  
14 hand, knowing that the sale motion and the proceeds thereof,  
15 will ultimately benefit the investors in the trusts, they  
16 certainly, I don't believe Judge -- I don't think I'm speaking  
17 out of turn -- I don't think they want to do anything, Judge,  
18 that's going to lead to the estate not being able to  
19 successfully transfer assets in accordance with law.

20 So that is a difficult conundrum. What we've tried to  
21 do, Judge, and what we've agreed to do, and the way we're going  
22 to do it, subject to Your Honor ordering this, is, if you will,  
23 bifurcate their objections. So on the one hand, Judge, in the  
24 next set of ordering paragraphs on page 6 and on page 7, so  
25 paragraph 15 and paragraph 16, this sets out the objections



1 which the parties do not believe will in any way, shape, or  
2 form chill a potential sale, and thus would be scheduled to be  
3 heard, Your Honor, prior to the sale hearing.

4 And these are what we call the pre-auction objections.  
5 And they're set forth in paragraph 16. And they really fall  
6 into three categories. First, to the extent that the trustees  
7 have any issues with any of the obligations that are not going  
8 to be made part of the agreements that are being assigned to  
9 Nationstar -- in other words a severing issue -- the trustees  
10 can raise that, provided however, Your Honor, that these would  
11 not be severing issues going to what is the biggest severing  
12 issue; and that is, the debtor believes there's a couple of  
13 legal ways in which the debtor can ultimately leave behind the  
14 seller obligations, the so-called put-back obligations, that  
15 are the heart of the claims that the investors through the  
16 trusts have.

17 They're not going to contest that form of  
18 severability. But in case there's any other issues that come  
19 up about what was technically severed, they'll raise that prior  
20 to the sale. So that's found in 16(a).

21 THE COURT: Because it appeared to me that this  
22 proposed stipulation had substantive effects and not just  
23 scheduling, that's why I want to be clear about what, if any,  
24 objections the trustees are agreeing will not be asserted or  
25 when they'll be asserted. This came up during the hearing last

1 week, and you said it was an important part of what you thought  
2 had been agreed with the trustees. But it's not a typical  
3 scheduling provision, because it does seem to have substantive  
4 effects, unless I'm misreading or misunderstanding.

5 MR. PRINCI: Your Honor, I'm not sure I'm clear on  
6 what the Court is referring to when you refer to "substantive".

7 THE COURT: Well, I want to be sure I understand  
8 what's pure scheduling and what's more substantive. The way I  
9 was reading this, and perhaps misreading it, the RMBS trustees  
10 were agreeing now that they wouldn't object to certain aspects  
11 of the proposed transactions. That, to me, is substantive.

12 MR. PRINCI: Understood. Okay.

13 THE COURT: It's not just here's the schedule, but we  
14 won't do that. Okay?

15 MR. PRINCI: Understood.

16 THE COURT: And I just want to be clear and have a  
17 clear record about what they're agreeing now will or won't be  
18 asserted. Not what will, because that they're waiting to see;  
19 but what they're agreeing now --

20 MR. PRINCI: Okay.

21 THE COURT: -- won't be asserted as objections.

22 MR. PRINCI: So that's a good way, then, to make this  
23 clear, Judge. Let me have you take a look at paragraph 17.  
24 And let me give you a moment just to read that again to  
25 yourself, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: I've read it.

2 MR. PRINCI: Okay. So, Judge, that is the focal point  
3 to the answer to Your Honor's question. It is that which is  
4 referenced in paragraph 17 that the trustees are agreeing to  
5 forego in connection with the sale motion.

6 THE COURT: And when I read it, because it starts out,  
7 "Subject only to the pre-auction objections," I then flipped  
8 back to look at the pre-auction objections, and that's where I  
9 just didn't have enough time to --

10 MR. PRINCI: Okay.

11 THE COURT: -- really work through it. I want to be  
12 clear what's saved by the "Subject to" introductory clause, and  
13 what is it that the RMBS trustees will not object to.

14 MR. PRINCI: Okay. So, Judge, let's go back to 16  
15 then.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MR. PRINCI: 16 gives you the three categories of  
18 objections that the trustees, if they choose to, are going to  
19 prosecute, which Your Honor will then hear on what will be the  
20 new hearing for the sale motion, presumably November 19th,  
21 subject to the Court's calendar. Okay?

22 THE COURT: I looked. That date works.

23 MR. PRINCI: Okay, good. And as I mentioned, the  
24 first category is very limited, if you will, to potential  
25 severing issues. And that's in contrast, Judge, for example,

1 to what 17 refers to, where 17 says that they won't seek to  
2 attempt to hold the sale up in any way, shape, or form, with  
3 respect to the transfer of these contracts, including they  
4 won't contest that there are any liabilities relating to the  
5 so-called origination-related provisions. And you'll see a  
6 reference, Judge, in the last sentence of paragraph 16, that's  
7 a similar proviso, where it says, "The pre-auction objections  
8 shall not include any objection by the trustees seeking to  
9 impose any obligation or liability," and I'm paraphrasing, with  
10 respect to the assigned RMBS contracts -- those are the ones  
11 going to Nationstar or the highest bidder -- in respect of the  
12 origination and sale of the mortgage loans, including, without  
13 limitation, the origination-related issues.

14 THE COURT: Those claims are the subject of numerous  
15 lawsuits, though?

16 MR. PRINCI: That's correct, Your Honor. Those are  
17 the ones, Your Honor, that constitute the debtors' and the  
18 institutional investors' agreement on an 8.7 billion dollar  
19 allowed claim. And so what the trustees are saying is we will  
20 not attempt to argue at the time of the sale, and  
21 correspondingly try to hold the sale up or attach to the sale,  
22 any of our rights respecting whether you can or can't sever  
23 those provisions. Okay?

24 What they are saying they want Your Honor to  
25 potentially hear, are three categories of objections, the so-

1 called limited severing issues. And we're not really sure what  
2 that is, Judge. They need a chance to be able to look at this  
3 further. And if they can't resolve with us some issue in that  
4 regard, then they may potentially argue to the Court that  
5 there's something that's not being assumed and assigned that  
6 should be. But won't be the Big Kahuna one, okay?

7 Then the second one, which is (b) in paragraph 16, is  
8 really adequate assurance, Judge. Okay? And (c), which is the  
9 third category, is sort of a subclass of adequate assurance,  
10 Judge. In the PSAs there are certain conditions having to do  
11 with, amongst other things, for example, the creditworthiness  
12 of a servicer. So it has to be -- the rating agencies -- you  
13 have to have a certain rating from the rating agencies.

14 Now, we believe 365(f) covers that and allows the  
15 debtor to transfer these contracts, notwithstanding such  
16 provisions. But at the end of the day, the trustees may well  
17 take the position that whether or not 365(f) covers it from a  
18 legal vantage point or not, we still think those very  
19 conditions go to whether we have adequate assurance of future  
20 performance.

21 I suspect Your Honor can see that we all believe,  
22 Judge, that we're going to work these out. Now, that's no  
23 guarantee from any of the parties. But these are the sorts of  
24 things, Judge --

25 THE COURT: See who the successful bidder is, then

1 maybe you'll know.

2 MR. PRINCI: That's a fair point. But subject to your  
3 good point about who the successful bidder is, we do think  
4 we'll work it out. We're certainly -- you won't get an  
5 objection, Your Honor, before the parties have certainly worked  
6 hard to work such issues out. Okay. So those are the pre-  
7 auction ones. And if those objections are filed by August  
8 23rd, then Your Honor will hear those as part of the motion on  
9 November 5th, in connection -- excuse me, on November 19, in  
10 connection with the sale hearing.

11 The rest of the ordering paragraphs, Your Honor -- and  
12 I will say, this is the most complicated part -- relates to two  
13 things. Number one, the objections to severing that have been  
14 preserved, well, if the trustees -- I shouldn't say trustees.  
15 Let's be technically correct. Any trust that opts in, what  
16 does that mean? That means it is agreeing to the settlement  
17 agreement that's the subject of the 9019 motion.

18 Now, working on the assumption that the Court has  
19 approved that motion, and then you have the November, let's  
20 say, approximately 12th date, when the trusts have to decide if  
21 they opt in. Now, there are 392 trusts that are the subject of  
22 the settlement agreement. And I think there's around eighty-  
23 five percent of them have been given a direction from the  
24 institutional investors. But there's another approximately,  
25 Judge, 200 trusts that are not part of that settlement

1 agreement.

2 We, the debtor, and the institutional investors,  
3 believe that those trusts are not likely to have the issues  
4 with respect to the put-back claims that these other trusts  
5 have. And therefore, they weren't made part of the proposed  
6 resolution in the settlement agreement. And there's a lot of  
7 technical reasons, Judge, that we don't need to get into today,  
8 as to why those other 200 or so trusts, we the debtors believe,  
9 are not likely to become a big issue in this case.

10 But that having been said, the Court needs to be  
11 aware, because the rest of the provisions do have to deal with  
12 this, that the trustees are the trustees not only in the 392  
13 trusts that are the subject of the settlement agreement, but  
14 they're trustees for about 200 additional trusts. And so  
15 they're going to have to make a decision through prudent man  
16 standard, okay, with respect to all the trusts that they're  
17 involved in.

18 So the next set of ordering paragraphs does two  
19 things. Number one is, it sets up a -- it makes clear that to  
20 the extent any trust should not opt in and therefore should  
21 still have this reserved severance claim -- and the reason that  
22 the opt-in is important, because if you opt in to the  
23 settlement agreement, by the very terms of the settlement  
24 agreement, you're releasing those so-called cure claims. Okay?  
25 So you will no longer have those preserved, because you will

1 have released them.

2 But to the extent any trust goes forward, meaning they  
3 haven't opted in, then to the extent that they succeed with  
4 those claims, in terms of -- that would be a cure claim. We,  
5 the debtor, and the committee, and the other parties involved,  
6 believe that as a matter of law, if you succeed in arguing that  
7 the debtor was not entitled to sever those put-back provisions,  
8 then we believe that in that situation, as a matter of law, you  
9 have a cure claim.

10 So to provide adequate protection for the payment of  
11 any cure claim, were it to be determined by the Court that  
12 there is one --

13 THE COURT: If you can't sever -- let me stop you  
14 there.

15 MR. PRINCI: Sure.

16 THE COURT: Why isn't it deemed a rejection if you  
17 can't sever? You're saying -- I mean, the conclusion that it's  
18 a cure claim assumes that that contract is being -- in total,  
19 is being assumed.

20 MR. PRINCI: That's right. So let me make sure the  
21 record is clear on this first. The debtor believes there are  
22 two ways it can legally, ultimately sever the so-called put-  
23 back obligations, from the rest of the servicing obligations,  
24 and transfer just the servicing obligations. We have informed  
25 the Court of the way we were going to go about this. That has



1 now, also, Judge -- another piece of good news, that's actually  
2 now been obviated. There won't be a need to do that, because  
3 the trustees are agreeing not to contest the transfer to the  
4 ultimate buyer, free and clear of this issue. Okay? So that's  
5 another great benefit of what we worked on and agreed to.

6 THE COURT: That's one of the substantive effects of  
7 this --

8 MR. PRINCI: Yes, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: -- scheduling order.

10 MR. PRINCI: Paragraph 17 -- that is a knockoff  
11 substantive effect of paragraph 17 in this order. But what  
12 everybody's doing is reserving their legal rights.

13 So what might be before Your Honor someday? Well, the  
14 trust -- any trust that doesn't opt in to the settlement and  
15 wants to test this issue, would file an objection saying I  
16 don't think the debtors had a legal right to do what they did.  
17 Now, I know I can't go and reel it back in, but per this order,  
18 if I'm right, this is a cure claim.

19 And the reason, in fairness, we're prepared to say  
20 it's a cure claim, is while one way we believe you can do this  
21 is to have certain debtor entities reject and then have other  
22 debtor entities assume; if that were to fail, the only other  
23 way to do this -- and this was done in the American Home  
24 Mortgage case -- is to treat the contracts as really being two  
25 contracts. Okay? And then as was done in that case, you

1 assume and assign one, and leave behind the other.

2 If that does not pass muster under the law, then from  
3 the trustee's vantage point, I think in fairness, what they're  
4 saying is, look, under this contract, you had to pay the put-  
5 back claim. You had to make us whole on that before you were  
6 able to assign it. You had no legal -- the Court has found you  
7 had no legal basis for severing this provision. Therefore,  
8 before you could assign it, you had to make us whole where your  
9 breach is, where your breach lies with the put-back claim. And  
10 therefore, our put-back claim is a cure claim.

11 So that claim is being preserved in order to provide  
12 adequate assurance that any cure claim, were the Court to find  
13 that there is one, would be paid, we are agreeing to treat any  
14 such allowed cure claim as an administrative expense.

15 THE COURT: And perhaps it reflects my own lack of  
16 understanding of this, but when I saw that, one question I had  
17 is whether other potential administrative creditors will have  
18 objections by virtue of the debtor agreeing that these cure  
19 claims would be treated as administrative claims? Is it  
20 conceivable that the debtors would wind up as administratively  
21 insolvent, that the amount you're agreeing to treat as  
22 administrative claims, potentially a large group of claims that  
23 might not otherwise be entitled to be treated as administrative  
24 claims, and therefore potentially diluting the recovery of  
25 other administrative creditors?

1 MR. PRINCI: Your Honor, as a practical matter, I  
2 believe that's virtually impossible, for the following reasons.  
3 We're only talking about a cure claim if the sale's gone  
4 through. Otherwise, by definition, there is no such thing as a  
5 cure claim, if you haven't assumed and assigned. So let's look  
6 at the consequence of the sale going through.

7 We're presently looking at an approximately 2.4  
8 billion dollar amount of proceeds. So I think just stopping  
9 there, I think we can -- I don't think anybody can feasibly  
10 suggest that there really is any chance that this estate will  
11 be administratively insolvent if the sale motion goes forward  
12 and is granted.

13 THE COURT: Will other unsecured creditors be able to  
14 argue that this is unfair discrimination because these claims  
15 should be treated -- their claims should be treated as the same  
16 level as -- the cure claims shouldn't be treated as  
17 administrative claims?

18 MR. PRINCI: And there, I think not, again, Judge.  
19 Because anybody who has a cure claim -- the trustees who are  
20 really -- what they're doing, Your Honor, in connection with  
21 this proposed order, is of tremendous value to this estate.  
22 Because they have a right to prosecute these. And this could  
23 turn out the wrong way for everybody depending upon how all  
24 that lands.

25 So but if you have a cure claim, legally, you're

1 entitled, we believe -- we the debtor believe, that you're  
2 entitled to have your cure claim paid from those proceeds  
3 before the rest of the estate gets them. So I don't see how an  
4 unsecured creditor can complain about the trustees being given  
5 an administrative expense here, because either way, the  
6 unsecured creditors were going to be behind that cure claim  
7 before they got a distribution from the proceeds.

8 Your Honor, I'm sorry, have I --

9 THE COURT: No, go ahead.

10 MR. PRINCI: Okay. So then if you take a look -- so  
11 what we have here, Judge, the rest of what this attempts to do  
12 is to deal with two things. Number one is, there is a cap with  
13 respect to the amount of the cure claim. Because one could  
14 well imagine, Judge, that given the kind of numbers you've  
15 heard, 8.7 billion, as what we're proposing for the allowed  
16 claim of these trusts, theoretically, you could be looking at  
17 an astronomical potential cure claim.

18 So the amount of the cure claim has been limited by a  
19 cap. And that cap --

20 THE COURT: That's the 600 million dollar cap?

21 MR. PRINCI: The 600 would be the max. But it's  
22 reduced, Your Honor. But it's further reduced as set forth  
23 here. But before I get into the weeds on that, I do want to  
24 explain the other thing these paragraphs deal with.

25 They deal with the fact, Judge, that you've got to try

1 to pro rate all this as against the trusts that accept, i.e.,  
2 opt in, and the trusts that don't accept. Okay? And so we've  
3 done that both definitionally and mechanically. By way of  
4 definition, if you go to paragraph 14, you'll see that we use  
5 pretty self-explanatory definitions: accepting trusts and  
6 nonaccepting trusts. And you'll see that that, Your Honor,  
7 works into these caps in subparagraph 18(b). You'll see that  
8 the way in which the cap works is, as you read through that,  
9 you'll see it is pro rata based on whether you're accepting or  
10 nonaccepting.

11 So let me just pause there before I get to the rest,  
12 which actually is -- 19 through 22 are relatively  
13 straightforward. But let me just see if the Court understands  
14 what those provisions are designed to do.

15 THE COURT: I'm not sure I'm prepared for a quiz right  
16 now, Mr. Princi, but why don't you go on.

17 MR. PRINCI: Okay. Well, I'm going to -- you know,  
18 Your Honor, I just had a sidebar with Mr. Eckstein, and I'm  
19 going to leave it to Mr. Eckstein to maybe flesh that out a  
20 little further. Your Honor, as I said, I think the rest of the  
21 paragraphs are relatively straightforward, particularly as  
22 against paragraph 18, which is not relatively straightforward.

23 But in addition, Your Honor, to the fact that this  
24 proposed order has been painstakingly negotiated by the  
25 creditors' committee, and is supported -- not just negotiated

1 but supported by the creditors' committee, the debtor, the RMBS  
2 trustees, the institutional investors; in addition, Your  
3 Honor, I believe Ally is okay with this, the parent company. I  
4 believe -- I haven't heard from any other party, Your Honor, a  
5 number of whom were involved in these discussions in one way or  
6 the other, that there's any objection to it.

7 And so I think this is -- when it comes to the  
8 complicated issues in this case, this order, Your Honor,  
9 provides great value and kind of takes the chaos and organizes  
10 it tremendously, here. And as you point out, there are also  
11 substantive benefits to this. So --

12 THE COURT: This is in the nit category -- I would  
13 like the title of this document changed. I don't -- it's now  
14 called "Revised Joint Omnibus Scheduling Order". Come up with  
15 some more words. I mean, because there are substantive --  
16 there are very substantive aspects to this. I don't want to  
17 hear in November, somebody comes out of left field and says,  
18 that was a scheduling order you entered. I didn't know there  
19 was substantive effects from it.

20 So it may be a revised joint omnibus scheduling order  
21 and provisions for other relief. I don't know. I just don't  
22 want to hear later that when objectors come in that -- and this  
23 is really -- I mean, those provisions really are impacting the  
24 RMBS trustees, potentially the investors, by virtue of that.  
25 But this is much more than just a scheduling order.

1 MR. PRINCI: Your Honor, we will do that. And it is.  
2 And in fact, I want to, Judge, point to two other things that I  
3 failed to sort of up front. And that's sort of in the specific  
4 obligations of the various parties with respect to deadlines.

5 If you go to page 4 and look at paragraph 2, it talks  
6 about the debtor filing a supplement. One of the benefits,  
7 Your Honor, of --

8 THE COURT: I guess you're filing another motion too?

9 MR. PRINCI: It'll be a supplement. We're not going  
10 to redo this motion, Judge. And just so that Your Honor  
11 understands, we have -- one of the benefits, and there were  
12 many -- one of the benefits of us spending a lot of time  
13 together, well into the night --

14 THE COURT: Sometimes that helps.

15 MR. PRINCI: It helped a lot, Judge. It helped an  
16 awful lot. And one of the benefits, Judge, is that we realized  
17 that there really are things that just needed to be clarified.  
18 And so amongst and between the parties, we have a short list.  
19 I'm actually going to be sending an e-mail to all of these  
20 parties tomorrow, just confirming what we talked about.

21 Just by way of example, one of those things -- you've  
22 heard me say this in open court before, I'll say it again --  
23 the 9019 motion is detached from the plan support agreement  
24 that we have with these same institutional investors. So it  
25 does not have any connection to the Ally issues that are being

1 examined by the examiner, et cetera, et cetera. And we'll make  
2 that -- we'll actually say that up front in the motion, if that  
3 will be helpful for people, et cetera.

4 So we have a few items that we all discussed that we  
5 think we need to clarify either in a motion, and in one  
6 particular instance, also potentially in the settlement  
7 agreement itself. And we're going to do that.

8 The other thing I just want to inform the Court,  
9 because I don't think this would be obvious what our intentions  
10 were with respect to this for the Court. There is a deadline  
11 here, Judge. I just need to find it. So please just give me a  
12 moment.

13 It is the fact that we are going to be working -- it  
14 may be expressed, and I'm just missing it while I'm on my  
15 feet -- but we're going to be working, Your Honor, on a  
16 proposed order for the 9019 motion. And Your Honor is well  
17 aware, because it's come out at these hearings on this, that  
18 there are difficult issues that the trustees need to balance in  
19 doing their job. And so the proposed order, Your Honor, which  
20 we will present to the Court well in advance, Judge, of the  
21 9019 hearing, will be designed to -- it'll have input from the  
22 trustees and of course the committee and everyone else that's a  
23 major party here, Judge. And it'll be designed to try to deal  
24 with some of those.

25 But what we'll make sure we do is to get to you and



1 present that to you early, allow the Court to schedule, if you  
2 want, with us, either a court session or a chambers session to  
3 discuss why we have these proposed findings. Now, all of that,  
4 Judge, in due course. And of course, none of what we put in  
5 the order, by way of any proposed findings, will be  
6 inconsistent with what we present at the hearing. So anything  
7 that we have in that order, that means we intend to cover that  
8 at the hearing.

9 I just do want to -- that wouldn't have been obvious,  
10 our intention from this order. And that is the intention of  
11 the parties, Judge.

12 THE COURT: Okay.

13 MR. PRINCI: Judge --

14 THE COURT: I will have some other comments. I'm  
15 going to save them, and questions. Okay?

16 MR. PRINCI: Let me cede the podium to Mr. Eckstein.

17 MR. ECKSTEIN: Your Honor, good afternoon. Kenneth  
18 Eckstein of Kramer Levin on behalf of the official creditors'  
19 committee.

20 Your Honor, first I'm going to echo Mr. Princi's  
21 remarks complimenting the parties for working together and  
22 constructively. And I'll certainly include the Morrison &  
23 Foerster team, on behalf of the debtor, in feeding us late into  
24 Thursday night and working, I think, constructively, to  
25 coalesce a lot of difficult issues where there were very

1 disparate viewpoints and interests.

2           Number two, I'd like to highlight, I think, a couple  
3 of the areas where the committee feels the greatest heartburn  
4 on this motion, because there are several issues that Your  
5 Honor has started to identify that are not simply scheduling,  
6 they're quite substantive, and they could affect the case as it  
7 runs its entire course.

8           The first is timing. As Your Honor sees from the  
9 schedule, the parties have ultimately agreed to a tight time  
10 schedule. It essentially has the parties conducting near-term  
11 discovery. And to the extent there are going to be parties who  
12 are going to be doing independent evaluations of the proposed  
13 settlement, certainly, the committee and the RMBS trustees, and  
14 there may be other parties as well, the parties have agreed  
15 that expert reports are going to be submitted really in about  
16 two months. And that's fast.

17           And I don't want to give Your Honor the impression  
18 that people were enthusiastic about the schedule. I think  
19 there was a practical recognition that one of the essential or  
20 important elements of this was to complete this process before  
21 the Court considered the sale hearing. And while we did obtain  
22 from Nationstar an agreement to extend the sale hearing out by  
23 two weeks, it still did not leave a significant amount of time.  
24 And in order to permit the discovery of the experts, the filing  
25 of objections, and the filing of replies, consistent with Your

1 Honor's schedule to conduct a hearing of this complexity, this  
2 was the schedule that parties ultimately were able to agree  
3 upon.

4 We're very much relying upon the full and complete  
5 cooperation of the debtor in terms of making the information  
6 available. And I'm hopeful that this will provide adequate  
7 time. Needless to say, if there are problems, parties will  
8 have to come back and deal with it. But that's not something  
9 that we're doing today. And Mr. Princi is right; all the  
10 parties that Mr. Princi described are willing to work with this  
11 schedule.

12 We had a committee call this morning. And I tried to  
13 impress upon the committee members the various elements of this  
14 agreement as it was finalized. And I think that people are all  
15 going to try to work with this schedule. And hopefully, we're  
16 not going to have the need to come back. And if we do, Your  
17 Honor will deal with that.

18 Number two, Mr. Princi did indicate that a supplement  
19 is going to be filed. Obviously, we're going to -- everybody's  
20 going to be very focused on the substance to that supplement.  
21 The letter that Mr. Princi described that he's going to be  
22 providing tomorrow, laying out the elements that we're going to  
23 see in the supplement, I believe will be consistent with the  
24 items that we've already discussed, and hopefully will give  
25 parties clarity on what modifications to expect. And we're

1 assuming that there are not going to be any material new  
2 changes that are going to sort of move us in a different  
3 direction.

4 But that's a very important submission. And we feel  
5 it's very important for all parties, not just the parties who  
6 were participating in this negotiation, but all parties in this  
7 case, to see the filing by August 15th, so that they have ample  
8 time to know, with detail, what precisely everybody is  
9 responding to. And given the complexities of this, I trust  
10 that the supplement will describe in the motion itself, all  
11 substantive provisions that people should really be aware of  
12 that could affect their evaluation of the settlement. And I  
13 think this will give us ample time to do that in a clear and  
14 comprehensive fashion.

15 The next item I wanted to bring to Your Honor's  
16 attention is the discussion that Mr. Princi had with you of the  
17 pre-auction objections and what we consider the potential  
18 claims that could give rise from that. That is the first  
19 category of administrative claims or potential administrative  
20 claims or cure claims, that we are dealing with.

21 One of the difficult elements of this agreement is  
22 that all parties are making a lot of assumptions that, at this  
23 point in time, are not based on any level of certainty, or  
24 really very little diligence. We have as much information as  
25 we've been able to collect, to date. But people do not know

1 with any certainty what types of pre-auction objections will be  
2 asserted by the trustees.

3 We have representations that these will not be  
4 significant or material, relative to the size of this case.  
5 And hopefully that will be the case. Moreover, we're hopeful  
6 that between now and when these claims are filed, that there'll  
7 be an ample opportunity for the trustees and the debtor and the  
8 committee to speak with Nationstar, which is the stalking-horse  
9 bidder on the servicing platform. And our goal is that many of  
10 these concerns will be resolved in discussions with Nationstar,  
11 so that there will not need to be claims filed, but that in  
12 fact, the trustees can get comfort that many of their concerns  
13 will be dealt with by the purchaser in the ordinary course, on  
14 an ongoing basis, post-closing.

15 THE COURT: Let me just stop you there. Because I  
16 deferred raising this with Mr. Princi, but this is an  
17 aggressive schedule. And the question I have is whether it  
18 builds in any time or sufficient time for negotiations.  
19 Because the last point you make, Mr. Eckstein, I just fully  
20 anticipate before the evidentiary hearings starts in this, the  
21 parties will sit down and knock heads and really try and see  
22 whether you can resolve -- wishful thinking -- all of the  
23 issues, some of the issues, whatever.

24 And with this aggressive schedule, the debtors' reply  
25 brief -- discussions don't have to await for then -- but the

1 debtors' reply brief is October 29th, and with a hearing  
2 commencing on November 5th. So that's actually one of the big  
3 concerns. So one of the concerns I have is time for the  
4 parties to be able to try and resolve -- negotiate, resolve as  
5 many issues as possible. And the second, and I guess I'll ask  
6 Mr. Siegel about this when he comes up, is what process are the  
7 trustees going to set up with the investors? Because I mean I  
8 think I fully expect the trustees don't want to get too far out  
9 front of the investors.

10 We've talked before about what this provision is,  
11 twenty-five percent being able to direct the action, will you  
12 follow or won't follow. But it seems to me that there are a  
13 number of things that have to work parallel. One, a process of  
14 the RMBS trustees with the investors; second, a dialog between  
15 the debtors, the committee, and the RMBS trustees; all of this  
16 going on while you've got discovery going on.

17 So I do have a concern that there's not enough built  
18 into this. And I don't want to complicate the schedule.  
19 Assuming I'm likely to agree to the schedule, I think that you  
20 all ought to work now on agreeing on an unofficial schedule by  
21 which, without prejudice to anybody's rights, claims,  
22 objections, that you will share preliminary objections. And  
23 you probably have already done this. I mean, it's not a  
24 mystery. But until you've done -- as you're doing your  
25 discovery.

1 I mean, I think you ought to be setting up a process  
2 that has informal meetings that aren't to discuss the discovery  
3 disputes or anything like that, but actual -- to see whether,  
4 as issues are arising, whether you can talk through them. I'm  
5 not compelling you to do that. But I'm just afraid you're  
6 going to get to the end of this schedule, and it's going to be  
7 a frantic path that you -- people are going to be getting ready  
8 for an evidentiary hearing; exhibits, et cetera, and all that;  
9 get their witnesses ready. And at the same time they're going  
10 to be trying to resolve whatever they can resolve. So I do  
11 have a concern about that.

12 MR. ECKSTEIN: If I may, let me take it in a couple of  
13 pieces. With respect to how the trustees are going to deal  
14 with the investor community, that is something that has been  
15 contemplated here. And I think it would be useful for Mr.  
16 Siegel or one of the spokespeople for the trustees to address  
17 that precisely. Because that's been anticipated. And I think  
18 that that will help significantly in sort of smoothing the path  
19 for the trustees to make a decision.

20 With respect to the particular issue I was starting  
21 with, which was the pre-auction objections; that deadline is  
22 August 23rd. I think Your Honor can take some comfort in the  
23 fact that discussions have already commenced between the  
24 trustees and Nationstar, as the stalking-horse bidder, and the  
25 other parties in the case, to see whether or not these precise

1 objections can get resolved. And again, being somewhat  
2 optimistic on this point, I think there is enough time between  
3 now and August 23rd for those issues to be worked out. And  
4 based on what I've heard so far, I'm encouraged that many, if  
5 not all, of those objections can be satisfactorily resolved on  
6 a business level by that deadline.

7 If those objections can get resolved, what it would  
8 mean is that there will not be pre-auction objections. If it's  
9 not resolved, I think the pre-auction objections will get  
10 filed. The one amendment that I was going to suggest to Mr.  
11 Princi's schedule is, in the event the pre-auction objections,  
12 which are, again -- those are the traditional servicing type of  
13 claims, not put-back claims -- if those have not been worked  
14 out satisfactorily --

15 THE COURT: Give me an example of what those would be.

16 MR. ECKSTEIN: Basically ongoing indemnities, what  
17 about taxes that might still be due and owing. They're not  
18 small numbers. But relative to the 2.4 billion dollar purchase  
19 price, they're numbers that we believe are considered more  
20 ordinary course.

21 But nonetheless, there are issues that are of concern  
22 to the trustees and there are really of concern to the  
23 purchaser. And they have to figure out a way to balance that  
24 out in a businesslike manner. We think that can be done. It's  
25 been done in other situations and hopefully can be done here.



1 But the suggestion I was going to make is in the event the pre-  
2 auction objections have not been worked out, I think it  
3 probably would make sense to actually set those down for a  
4 hearing prior to November 19th. Although I don't think we need  
5 to fix that date today, I think we wait and see whether or not  
6 any objections are filed, and then we can come back and decide  
7 what the schedule is.

8 But it might make sense to set those down for a  
9 somewhat earlier hearing, if they, in fact get filed. And so I  
10 just wanted to flag that. Because even if they're not resolved  
11 by August 23rd, they could get resolved before a hearing date.  
12 So that's one type of objection.

13 We're concerned about those. We would obviously, from  
14 the committee's standpoint, we would like to eliminate those  
15 objections and would try to do what we can to ensure that's the  
16 case. And obviously, to the extent those are resolved with the  
17 purchaser by August 23rd, it'll be known to any third party who  
18 might submit a competing bid that those have been resolved, and  
19 bidders can take account of how that's dealt with in connection  
20 with any supplemental filing that's made.

21 The next category of concern was the last item that  
22 Mr. Princi was talking about with respect to the cure claims.  
23 It is quite complex. And it took us a lot of time. It's a  
24 real balance. The benefit -- one of the benefits of this  
25 agreement is that the trustees and all parties have agreed to

1 allow the sale to go forward without objections. We believe,  
2 Your Honor, that that is going to maximize the value of the  
3 transaction. And we believe it will stimulate bidding at the  
4 highest possible level, which should redound to the benefit of  
5 the estate. And so that's a plus.

6 If there was litigation with the trustees leading up  
7 to the sale, it might not derail the sale, but it could  
8 certainly distract the sale, and probably would be taken out of  
9 the purchase price, just by people being skittish. And so  
10 hopefully this will redound to the benefit of the estate.

11 Now, on the other hand, we understood that until the  
12 trustees have made a decision whether they're going to opt in,  
13 we don't know whether or not they are or are not going to want  
14 to assert the sort of large cure claims that would essentially  
15 result from whether or not it was or was not appropriate to  
16 sever the origination from the servicing, and therefore,  
17 potentially give rise to a cure claim that's related to the  
18 put-back litigation.

19 Obviously, if those claims get asserted, that will be  
20 a major litigation. And nobody is waiving any rights at this  
21 point in time, with one exception. If the trustees do not opt  
22 in -- as Mr. Princi explained, it may not be all or nothing; it  
23 may be that they opt out for some trusts, they opt in for other  
24 trusts -- and so the paragraph that Mr. Princi explained,  
25 paragraph 18 has a pro rata. So whatever caps are provided

1 there are pro rata and will come down.

2 From the committee's standpoint, Your Honor put your  
3 finger on it. Looking at it this from the standpoint of the  
4 unsecured creditors, we do not want to find ourselves in a  
5 situation where we have swamped this estate with administrative  
6 claims. On the other hand, we felt it was advantageous for the  
7 sale to go forward and to defer this fight until it became  
8 necessary and not to front load this debate.

9 And so obviously, the first sort of level of defense  
10 is, the trustees may ultimately decide to opt in to the  
11 settlement. If they opt in to the settlement, there will be no  
12 claims that get triggered by paragraph 18. It'll be a zero.  
13 In the event the trustees do not fully opt in, the question  
14 is --

15 THE COURT: Assume the worst. What happens if they  
16 just don't opt in, period?

17 MR. ECKSTEIN: If they don't opt in, then there'll be  
18 a lot of questions that Your Honor will have if they don't opt  
19 in. But the question will really be, what is the significance  
20 of the settlement? How does it apply? I'm told -- and again,  
21 this remains to be seen -- the likelihood of there being no  
22 participation in this settlement, I don't want to say is -- it  
23 seems extreme at this point in time, but it's possible.

24 And so let's assume they don't opt in. Okay. So this  
25 paragraph contemplates that. In that event, the trustees will

1 assert a claim that essentially says that the put-back claims  
2 are not severable from the transfer of the portfolio, and  
3 therefore, in order to transfer the portfolio, the debtor -- or  
4 the purchaser, essentially, had to assume the put-back claims,  
5 and therefore cure.

6 Now, we know nobody is going to buy this portfolio if  
7 they had to assume all the put-back litigation. Just was not  
8 going to happen. So therefore, this is sort of a architecture  
9 that is providing for the ability to sell and then deal with  
10 how to sort of allocate the proceeds. So there'll be a  
11 litigation over whether or not, as a legal matter, there was or  
12 was not an obligation for a purchaser to have assumed the cure  
13 claims with respect to the put-back litigation.

14 Your Honor may determine that the debtor was within  
15 its rights legally to have sold free and clear, in which case,  
16 there'd be no cure claim. And whatever claim ultimately the  
17 trustees have will be a general unsecured claim. And if the  
18 trustees don't opt in to this settlement, there'll be a trial  
19 in the future as to what the appropriate amount of the  
20 unsecured claim would be. That's not something we would have  
21 to deal with today. But it will clearly be something that'll  
22 be pivotal to a plan, and we'll have to have a separate hearing  
23 and a process on how to deal with the claims.

24 In the event Your Honor determines that there was no  
25 right to sever, and that there was an obligation to assume

1 these claims, what paragraph 18 says is that there'll be a cap  
2 on these claims. And there's a dual cap. The first cap Mr.  
3 Princi identified was 600 million dollars. But what paragraph  
4 18(b) says, it's the lesser of the aggregate sale proceeds for  
5 all settlement trusts or 600 million dollars. So what you  
6 really need to do is go into the definition and look at the  
7 sale proceeds that are attributable to the trusts that don't  
8 opt into the settlement. And we, in fact, believe -- we don't  
9 have to get into the details -- we believe that the relevant  
10 sale proceeds that are going to be at issue, are in fact, less  
11 than 600 million dollars. We think it's materially less than  
12 600 million.

13 Again, this is not something for today. But our view  
14 is, it is materially less, and Your Honor will have to  
15 obviously consider that. But we think that the amount of  
16 potential exposure is a small fraction of 600 million. But  
17 just as belt and suspenders, we have an aggregate cap of 600  
18 million.

19 In addition, if fifty percent of the trusts opt in and  
20 fifty percent of the trusts opt out, the aggregate cap will be  
21 300 million, and the sale proceeds will be fifty percent of the  
22 maximum sale proceeds, because half the trusts will have opted  
23 in.

24 So there's a lot of ways for the cap to come down to a  
25 much lower number so that we ultimately satisfied ourselves

1 from a committee standpoint that the likely exposure is boxed  
2 in enough different ways that the potential administrative  
3 claim relative to the -- certainly to the 2.4 billion dollars,  
4 but even to what is likely to be available to unsecured  
5 creditors after you satisfy the DIP and other secured  
6 obligations, we believe is a manageable, appropriate number,  
7 and is a sensible, essentially, trade today, for the ability to  
8 let the sale go forward on the best possible terms.

9 THE COURT: Wait. I don't want to come out of left  
10 field on this. But is this, itself, a substantive settlement  
11 that has to be judged? I mean, you've packed into a scheduling  
12 order quite substantive provisions. And I mean, why isn't this  
13 a 9019? Why -- first off, do the RMBS trustees have the  
14 authority to agree to these substantive provisions?

15 MR. ECKSTEIN: There's a lot -- Your Honor, there's a  
16 lot of substance here. And again, I'm trying --

17 THE COURT: The last thing I want to do is -- I mean,  
18 this seems to make good sense to me. But I also want to make  
19 sure I'm not missing the forest for the trees. Is there --

20 MR. ECKSTEIN: I don't think you're missing the forest  
21 for the trees, Your Honor. And I think these are questions  
22 that we've all been asking ourselves. And we do think that  
23 we've set up a format that is best designed to lead to a  
24 consensual resolution of a very, very thorny problem.

25 Now, again, I haven't begun to address whether the

1 committee is satisfied that 8.7 is an appropriate settlement.  
2 We may decide that it's way too high. And in that case, we'll  
3 have to obviously weigh in on that issue. But assuming this is  
4 ultimately determined to be a reasonable settlement, we believe  
5 that there is a mechanism in place right now that maximizes the  
6 ability of all parties: the trustees, the investors, and the  
7 estate, to resolve a very difficult, thorny problem that would  
8 likely consume years of litigation, and I hate to say, tens and  
9 tens of millions of dollars of expense or more. And we have a  
10 mechanism right now that seems to be designed to lead to a  
11 consensual resolution of a very difficult problem in a  
12 relatively prompt period of time in a way that will give all  
13 parties a great deal of comfort, without waiving rights.

14 And at this point in time, from the estate's  
15 standpoint, Your Honor, we don't believe that anybody is  
16 waiving any claims. We think the estate's getting the benefit  
17 of some agreed-upon -- some business agreements with respect to  
18 caps on what claims will be asserted. And we think the estate  
19 can receive the benefit of that.

20 The trustees have given a great deal of thought -- and  
21 I'll let them obviously speak to it -- but the trustees have  
22 obviously given a great deal of thought and consideration to  
23 what is and is not appropriate at this stage. And I believe  
24 the trustees will tell you that they are comfortable with  
25 proceeding with the order as it's currently structured. And it

1 defers to a later date the rights of all parties to make  
2 whatever arguments and submissions have to be made, if those  
3 litigations become necessary.

4 So we felt that on balance, the estate was getting  
5 good benefits from this, and that the Court need only deal with  
6 these claims in the event circumstances warrant and based upon  
7 decisions that get made over the next couple of months. And  
8 that's what led us to recommend that this was a sensible way to  
9 proceed; although I agree with Your Honor that this is not  
10 simply a garden-variety scheduling order. It is far from it.

11 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Eckstein.

12 Mr. Siegel?

13 MR. SIEGEL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm Glenn  
14 Siegel from the Bank -- representing the Bank of New York. I'm  
15 with Dechert. Just to make sure that no stone is left unturned  
16 on the thanks being expressed to everyone, of course we thank  
17 Morrison & Foerster and Kramer Levin for their hard work. I  
18 should mention our co-trustees, which are Deutsche Bank,  
19 represented by Morgan Lewis; U.S. Bank represented by Seward &  
20 Kissel; Wells Fargo, represented by Alston & Bird. Also, the  
21 institutional investors were integral to this, and Ropes & Gray  
22 and Gibbs & Bruns were very heavily involved as well.

23 From our standpoint, there were a lot of things going  
24 on here that the trustees needed to get comfort with in order  
25 to be able to go forward. It was a very important component of



1 this that we have the opportunity to have a supplemental motion  
2 filed, which we think will give us a great deal more comfort in  
3 the process.

4 THE COURT: You haven't seen it yet. I don't know.

5 MR. SIEGEL: Well, we talked about it. If it's what  
6 we've talked about, I think we'll be okay. And we've spent a  
7 lot of time talking about it.

8 Your Honor, also Mr. Eckstein mentioned the issues  
9 about as they relate to the sale. Your Honor, I would suggest  
10 to you that what's really going on here is a deferral of rights  
11 by the RMBS trustees in connection with the sale that we have  
12 agreed to, that for the moment, absent the 600 million dollar  
13 issue, that there really isn't anything that is being finally  
14 resolved with respect to any of our trusts.

15 And with respect to the 600 million dollar issue,  
16 while I respect and appreciate Mr. Eckstein's view that that  
17 number is substantially less, we of course believe it to be  
18 substantially more. And by the way, Your Honor, that's another  
19 reason why we could agree on a number that was different.

20 With respect to authority, as we've talked about  
21 previously; this is different than the typical trust indenture  
22 that we encounter in bankruptcy cases. For better or worse,  
23 the trustees have authority to act under these documents. We  
24 can enter into this agreement. The question is what our  
25 tolerance is for holders who might disagree with us. We think

1 in this context, under these circumstances, particularly  
2 involving an issue where we were very concerned about two  
3 issues: one is maximizing the value of the sale itself; and  
4 the other is providing for a smooth transition of our servicing  
5 rights to a new servicer that's financially viable; we thought  
6 this was a very reasonable outcome vis-a-vis our certificate  
7 holders. And that's why we are comfortable with the outcome.

8 As we said, there are very good and substantial issues  
9 here that we are deferring to another day. Just to be clear,  
10 so that there's no surprise down the road, in the event that  
11 this actually becomes a relevant issue, there are three  
12 possible parties who would be liable for put-back claims.  
13 There are the originators of these loans; there are the  
14 depositors of these loans; and then finally, there is the  
15 servicer entity itself, which had obligations to provide  
16 notice, and in some instances, enforce these claims.

17 In some instances these are the same debtors. In some  
18 instances these are different debtors. These are very complex  
19 and thorny issues. And I very much agree with Mr. Eckstein  
20 that if we had to raise these issues prior to the sale, that it  
21 would create a substantial cloud on the sale going forward. So  
22 what we've determined to do is to maximize the sales proceeds  
23 instead of minimizing them and perhaps winning a Pyrrhic  
24 victory, winning the claim, and then not getting the assets  
25 sold. So we thought that was a very reasonable approach going

1 forward.

2 Your Honor, I'm going to do the best I can -- I've  
3 taken lots of notes here of the various things that came up --  
4 and try to cover them. If I've forgotten anything or if you  
5 think the answer's already been provided to you, I would just  
6 ask that you respond accordingly. Let's just see here.

7 First of all, Your Honor should know, vis-a-vis our  
8 reviewing the settlement and contacting the certificate  
9 holders, we have retained a financial advisor; we've retained  
10 Duff & Phelps as our financial advisor. We think they are very  
11 well qualified to do this. My understanding is that we now  
12 have access to the data room, and we are moving forward. And  
13 we are told that this time frame will be a time frame within  
14 which we will be able to make our evaluation.

15 In terms of getting in touch with our certificate  
16 holders, we are going to provide a very substantial and robust  
17 notice to them that we will be sending out, I believe it's the  
18 22nd. We are also going to hire a facilitator --

19 THE COURT: 22nd of which month?

20 MR. SIEGEL: Of August. It's the 22nd, right?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm looking now. Yes, it is.

22 MR. SIEGEL: We are also going to hire a facilitator.  
23 What I mean by that is there are companies that will make sure  
24 the notices get to people to the extent they can; because,  
25 again, we believe it to be very important that people know

1 what's going on. This will also be posted. It will be  
2 advertised. We will do what we can to make sure that people  
3 get the notice that they need.

4 Part of the time frame established for the motion is  
5 related to the amount of days we think is reasonable, based  
6 upon traditional practice for corporate trustees between  
7 sending the notice and the objection period. And we have built  
8 that into the schedule as well. It is important to us, and we  
9 think it's important to the certificate holders, that if they  
10 have issues with respect to this settlement, that they have an  
11 opportunity to express those before this Court and for us to  
12 hear them, to see them --

13 THE COURT: How active is the market for trading of  
14 these certificates?

15 MR. SIEGEL: It's not clear to me. I can tell you  
16 that most of this paper was held in institutional hands,  
17 traditionally. We have been receiving some calls from some  
18 hedge funds. So they are starting to get some of this paper.  
19 I do not know if anyone is going to be in a position to provide  
20 a critical mass or a direction to any of us with respect to  
21 this.

22 From our standpoint, this is not going to be a squeaky  
23 wheel issue. It's not going to be whoever makes the most  
24 noise, that's what we're going to do, particularly because  
25 there are so many trusts involved. From our standpoint, is we

1 are going to do a reasonable, studied review of this  
2 settlement. We're going to figure out whether or not these  
3 numbers make sense. And by the way, we've also reserved on the  
4 allocation between the trusts, which is very important as well.

5 We are going to look at the objections that are filed.  
6 We're going to determine in connection with those objections  
7 whether or not they alter our means of looking at the  
8 settlement as well. And we're going to make a reasoned  
9 decision. And we're going to ask this Court to make a finding  
10 with respect to that decision. But be sure we take this very  
11 seriously. We want to hear from our certificate holders. And  
12 we worked very hard to give them the most reasonable amount of  
13 notice, under the circumstances that we're presented with.

14 There is a very strong sense that this needs to be  
15 done prior to the sale. And we have now been able to  
16 accommodate that timing, for among other reasons, the  
17 willingness of the stalking-horse bidder to adjourn this for  
18 two weeks. That -- given the shortness of time, two weeks can  
19 even be a lot of time here.

20 The other thing I just would mention for the sake of  
21 clarification is that there are two universes of trusts here.  
22 There are the trusts to whom the settlement is being offered  
23 and the trusts to whom the settlement is not being offered.  
24 With respect to those trusts who have the opportunity to  
25 settle, they're going to be subject to the cap.

1           We have basically created a process where those other  
2 trusts will ride through. Their rights, other than this  
3 deferral that we've agreed to, will be unaffected. Now, having  
4 said that, just so the Court has comfort, the debtor has  
5 advised us that given the nature of those trusts, that they  
6 expect that the amount of potential put-back claims dwarfs the  
7 amount that we're talking about here; that it's not a  
8 significant amount.

9           It's important to the trustees that we try to resolve  
10 those claims as well. But we do not see the urgency nor do  
11 other parties see the urgency of resolving that prior to the  
12 sale. However, that will be hopefully before Your Honor  
13 relatively quickly, in the form of a settlement that will  
14 happen post-sale, down the road; because we want to clean this  
15 up. We want to have as many allowed claims as possible down  
16 the road. And Your Honor should expect, if all goes well, that  
17 that will be before you late this year or early next year.

18           Now, I'm not sure, but I think I've covered at least  
19 what I put on my notes. So if Your Honor has other questions,  
20 I'm happy to answer them.

21           THE COURT: I don't.

22           MR. SIEGEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

23           THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Siegel.

24           Anyone else wish to be heard?

25           MS. TOMASCO: Your Honor, on the phone.

1 THE COURT: Why don't you hold off; let me get the  
2 people in the courtroom and then I will absolutely hear you on  
3 the phone, okay?

4 MS. TOMASCO: Thank you.

5 MR. WOFFORD: Your Honor, good afternoon. Keith  
6 Wofford from Ropes & Gray on behalf of the RMBS certificate  
7 holders, often referred to as the institutional investors.

8 Just following up on some of the remarks of the  
9 debtors and the committee and implications of the Court, some  
10 of them refer to the schedule for this 9019, whether as  
11 originally posited or as put forth in the schedule, as  
12 aggressive. But in fact, the proposed schedule, both initial  
13 and current, is somewhat reflective of the foresight of the  
14 debtors in this case.

15 The debtors knew, Your Honor, from their initial  
16 diligence as well as from their discussions with us that the  
17 complications of effectively transferring the servicing  
18 platform without a resolution of the putback claims was almost  
19 like a Rubik's cube to solve. And the settlement was a means  
20 to try to avoid that Rubik's cube. As a result of the  
21 complications, the debtors initially sought the schedule and a  
22 scheduling track that would allow the putback claims to be  
23 resolved before the sale hearings. What has changed between  
24 that initial motion and now is that we've gotten consensus from  
25 other major constituents in the cases that in fact the

1 rationale behind that schedule, and in fact the way to solve  
2 that Rubik's cube is, in fact, to get the settlement forward  
3 and done -- hopefully done, at least with all the reservations  
4 of the parties-in-interest.

5           Despite the complexity that Your Honor refers to in  
6 this order -- and I won't use the term scheduling order for a  
7 fear of prejudicing anyone -- the fact of the matter is it is  
8 that complexity that allows this to be resolved in a way that  
9 effectively preserves the rights of the parties, as the  
10 committee noted, while allowing the sale to go forward at the  
11 same time, bringing the value into the estates, which we as  
12 investors have ultimate interest in, as well as everyone else  
13 here.

14           With respect to the one particularized question, Your  
15 Honor, that I would like to answer, the view of the investors  
16 is that a 9019 is not required from this motion because in fact  
17 this is not compromising or settling any claims on behalf of  
18 the estates. There certainly are some concessions that are  
19 being made by the trustees, but what this is doing is  
20 preserving an opportunity for a later day for those claims to  
21 be litigated. And as the committee rightly noted, it's  
22 effectively a downward ratchet from a threshold that protects  
23 the trustees, but then actually ratchets downwards so there  
24 isn't undue prejudice to the unsecured creditor pool.

25           With that, Your Honor, I don't think I'd say anything



1 further, other than that the institutional investors support  
2 the schedule and the trustees' entry into it.

3 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Wofford.

4 Anyone else wish to be heard?

5 MR. SHORE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Chris Shore  
6 from White & Case on behalf of the ad hoc group of junior  
7 secured notes.

8 Your Honor asked a couple of questions, and you got a  
9 couple of answers on the administrative expense priority. We  
10 negotiated and got put in -- at least for the junior secured  
11 notes -- paragraph 22 in the order, which sets forth that  
12 whatever administrative expense priority is ultimately allowed  
13 is not going to affect the nature, extent or priority of the  
14 claims of the junior secured noteholders.

15 THE COURT: Thank you.

16 Anyone else wish to be heard?

17 Anyone on the phone?

18 MS. TOMASCO: Your Honor, this is Patty Tomasco on  
19 behalf of Frost Bank.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

21 MS. TOMASCO: I just -- and I apologize, but I'm  
22 getting this order on Friday afternoon, and the original order  
23 basically preserved the rights of counterparties to executory  
24 contracts that were not RMBS trustees and people involved in  
25 the settlement. And so I would just like some clarification on

1 a couple of paragraphs that have nothing to do with the  
2 settlement, but just whether or not they apply to  
3 counterparties to assume servicing contracts that are not RMBS  
4 contracts.

5 Beginning on page 4, it says that fact discovery  
6 responses are due in ten days, but it doesn't specify whether  
7 or not that applies to non-RMBS counterparties who are  
8 otherwise objecting to the sale motion.

9 THE COURT: Let me stop there.

10 Mr. Princi, can you address that?

11 MR. PRINCI: It does, Your Honor. It does.

12 THE COURT: The same schedule --

13 MR. PRINCI: The same schedule --

14 THE COURT: The deadline applies.

15 MR. PRINCI: Yes, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 MS. TOMASCO: And so that does apply, and the non-RMBS  
18 counterparties also have the benefit of the shortened discovery  
19 response time?

20 THE COURT: Yes. The schedule has got to apply. If  
21 the deadline applies for objections, the same shortened time  
22 for discovery has to apply.

23 MS. TOMASCO: Thank you, Your Honor.

24 It says on page 6 in paragraph 15, it says that the  
25 debtor shall provide the RMBS trustees and the creditors'

1 committee all the performance-based information they have  
2 received by Nationstar. Frost Bank also has a servicing  
3 contract that the debtors proposed to assume and assign to  
4 Nationstar, but they're not included in this disclosure. I was  
5 wondering if any other counterparty to a servicing contract  
6 could be added to that paragraph?

7 THE COURT: Mr. Princi?

8 Which paragraph -- just so I'm clear, what --

9 MR. PRINCI: Your Honor, this is paragraph 15. Your  
10 Honor --

11 MS. TOMASCO: 15.

12 MR. PRINCI: Yes. Your Honor, this arose specifically  
13 in connection with the issues that these parties are raising  
14 with us. I would -- rather, Your Honor, than have other  
15 parties start to use this to make and have us deal with any  
16 information requests, I would recommend that counsel contact my  
17 office. We don't stand on principle when it comes to  
18 information requests; we're happy to provide information  
19 without the formality of formal discovery requests. But I  
20 don't think any of the parties here now, Your Honor, want to  
21 start to alter these terms to start having other parties use  
22 this to make information requests.

23 MS. TOMASCO: Well, I would comment, Your Honor, that  
24 Frost Bank did raise specifically the same objection to the  
25 identity of the purchaser, in particular with respect to

1 whether or not the purchaser such as Nationstar would meet the  
2 financial requirements so as to provide adequate assurance of  
3 future performance, in particular, whether or not they meet the  
4 financial criteria that's in the servicing agreement.

5 And so I'm not just a random other counterparty; my  
6 client is not. We raised the exact same objection as the RMBS  
7 trustees did. I'm happy to send the request. I just want to  
8 make it clear that we're not a lessor or some other person. We  
9 have a similar agreement to the RMBS trustees; they're just not  
10 in the securitization itself.

11 MR. PRINCI: Your Honor, the debtors will provide that  
12 information; that's not the issue. All I'm saying is we don't  
13 want to start to alter this particular proposed order. But I'm  
14 happy to say on the record we have no problem providing the  
15 information, in terms of memorializing this. If counsel can  
16 just contact my office, this will not be an issue.

17 THE COURT: Why don't you contact Mr. Princi or his  
18 colleagues. If you can't resolve the issue satisfactorily to  
19 Mr. Princi, you can arrange a conference call with the Court  
20 and we'll try and address it. There was a lot of work that  
21 obviously went into this proposed order. I don't undere -- I'm  
22 not giving short shrift to the issues you're raising; I think  
23 they're important. Let's see whether you're able to resolve  
24 them with Mr. Princi, and if you can't, you can come back and  
25 ask for help from the Court, okay?

1 MS. TOMASCO: Thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to  
2 clarify that the other fact discovery provisions of the order  
3 are equally applicable to non-RMBS --

4 THE COURT: Yes. It must be.

5 MS. TOMASCO: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: The objection deadline -- if the other  
7 deadlines apply, the discovery deadlines need to apply.

8 MS. TOMASCO: Thank you, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 Anyone else on the telephone wish to be heard?

11 MR. MOAK: Your Honor, Paul Moak on behalf of Freddie  
12 Mac.

13 THE COURT: Yes. Go ahead.

14 MR. MOAK: I had a question similar to those raised by  
15 Frost Bank's counsel. In particular, it is how the parties  
16 reconcile this proposed scheduling order with the Court's  
17 previously entered sales procedure order for parties that are  
18 not RMBS trustees, like Freddie Mac. And for example, the  
19 sales procedure order established a cure objection deadline of  
20 September 28th, and a deadline to object to the sale  
21 transaction generally by October 29th. And it's unclear to  
22 me -- even after the discussion we've had -- about whether, for  
23 example, the pre-auction objection deadline alters that  
24 schedule in any way for parties other than RMBS trustees.

25 For example, in paragraph 16 it reads "except as

1 limited by this paragraph, on or before August 23rd the  
2 committee, the RMBS trustee or any other party-in-interest may  
3 file any pre-auction objections". And I guess the "may" makes  
4 that permissive rather than compulsory, so maybe it's not an  
5 issue. But I just need some clarity on whether parties other  
6 than RMBS trustees are expected to -- are required to file what  
7 are labeled as "pre-auction objections" on or before August  
8 23rd. Because, for example, one of those potential objections  
9 is an objection to the ability of the proposed assignee to  
10 perform under the assumed servicing agreements, which I've  
11 heard interpreted to mean you need to file objections to  
12 adequate assurance as a pre-auction objection. So it was  
13 unclear to me how this impacts the previous sales procedure  
14 order.

15 THE COURT: Mr. Princi?

16 MR. PRINCI: Your Honor, and that's a very fair and  
17 understandable set of questions. So to clarify, Your Honor,  
18 none of the provisions in the previously issued what we call  
19 sales procedure order are intended to be affected by this  
20 order, except as expressly provided; and let me say what I mean  
21 by that. So for example, we're now going to have the hearing  
22 on the sales motion move from November 5th to November 19th.

23 With respect to the specific deadlines that are set  
24 forth -- and there are a number of them -- in the sales  
25 procedure order for dealing with cure claims and the like,

1 those remain in effect. Paragraph 16 is designed specifically  
2 for the RMBS trustees, but we felt, Your Honor, all the parties  
3 felt that we shouldn't preclude any other party who may want to  
4 also file any similar sorts of claims from doing so by that  
5 date so there would be an orderly timetable for those types of  
6 questions, but --

7 THE COURT: So the "may" means may.

8 MR. PRINCI: May.

9 THE COURT: It doesn't mean "shall".

10 MR. PRINCI: "May" means totally "may". We are not  
11 looking, Your Honor, to otherwise revise the specific schedule  
12 set forth in the sale procedure order.

13 THE COURT: Mr. Moak, are you satisfied with that  
14 answer?

15 MR. MOAK: I am, Your Honor. Thank you.

16 THE COURT: Thank you.

17 Anybody else on the phone wish to be heard?

18 Anybody else in the courtroom?

19 All right.

20 MR. PRINCI: Your Honor, if I may?

21 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Principi.

22 MR. PRINCI: Thank you. Very briefly, Your Honor.

23 Your Honor raised something that I think is important  
24 earlier. And you talked about the parties would be wise to  
25 confer informally, if you will. Your Honor, notwithstanding

1 how it may have appeared from the last time we were here -- and  
2 indeed, it may have appeared that we don't converse regularly  
3 enough -- the truth is -- and I'll let anybody here who  
4 disagrees with this, obviously, inform you -- the truth is the  
5 trustees and we have been regularly communicating about things.  
6 We regularly communicate with the committee about these sorts  
7 of things, Judge. And so, Your Honor, from the debtors'  
8 vantage point we're going to continue to seek to communicate  
9 with the parties.

10 What's going to happen, Judge, in terms of the  
11 finality of their decisions, it's not going to -- it's going to  
12 evolve. This is not going to be a lightning strike at the  
13 deadline. So directionally, Your Honor, people are going to  
14 start to get a sense through what they're hearing from their  
15 financial advisors of whether they think that they're likely  
16 moving towards an agreement with the debtor and the  
17 institutional investors' assessment of what is a fair  
18 settlement or not. And no doubt, Your Honor, we are all  
19 motivated to talk about that beforehand. We all have our  
20 independent but parallel motivations that will lead us to be  
21 speaking to each other, Your Honor, prior to these deadlines.

22 So I did want to just note that.

23 THE COURT: Mr. Princi, I know you talk to each other,  
24 but -- although last week's hearing might suggest otherwise --  
25 but with everything you have going on -- and I recognize



1 there's an enormous amount going on; there are a lot of moving  
2 pieces to this -- sometimes the formality of knowing that there  
3 is a regularly scheduled, periodic meeting -- which may wind up  
4 getting cancelled if everybody agrees to cancel it -- assures  
5 that issues won't get lost in the shuffle. I'm not requiring  
6 you to do it at this stage, okay. But I just -- we spent two  
7 and a half hours at a hearing last week talking about a  
8 schedule. That was nuts.

9 Okay, if it took two and a half hours of court time to  
10 talk about a schedule, what about the real issues? And the  
11 stipulation that you've submitted has a got a lot of real  
12 issues; there are real substantive things that are built into  
13 it. I think that you and the other counsel need to talk and  
14 need to try and work out -- and maybe you've got to get to the  
15 middle or end of August for it to really make sense to have.  
16 But I really think you need -- and I may at some point order  
17 that it happen that there be time scheduled -- if not every  
18 week, every other week -- for face-to-face meetings where you  
19 all sit in the room so you know there's no misunderstanding  
20 about what issues.

21 It's without prejudice. If Mr. Siegel doesn't raise  
22 an issue at a particular meeting he's not foregoing raising it  
23 at a later time, or vice versa, or the committee -- whatever.  
24 But you all ought to agree that the meetings are off the record  
25 and that it's not going to get quoted back to the Court that he

1 said, she said, et cetera. But you need to have a regular  
2 dialogue, because I'm really concerned, with an aggressive  
3 schedule, you're going to get toward the end of this process  
4 there's not going to be enough time built in to try and get  
5 issues resolved. That's end of speech on that.

6 MR. PRINCI: Okay. Your Honor, nobody can disagree  
7 with that suggestion. So what we'll do, Your Honor, we will  
8 consult with the parties. Without committing anybody, Your  
9 Honor, we'll probably be suggesting that we give some people --  
10 we give everybody an opportunity to get their arms around the  
11 facts. And then probably -- let's say mid --

12 THE COURT: I'm going to leave it to you. I'm not  
13 dictating what you're going to do.

14 MR. PRINCI: -- mid-September we'll start to arrange  
15 that, Judge.

16 THE COURT: I think you've all heard what I'm trying  
17 to communicate.

18 MR. PRINCI: Okay. Real quickly, Judge, just -- I had  
19 mentioned before and I wasn't able on my feet to locate it, but  
20 just so that I point Your Honor to the correct provision, in  
21 paragraph 2, page 4, in addition to filing the supplement by  
22 August 15, we're also going to be filing a revised proposed  
23 order. And that's what I was referencing earlier, Judge.  
24 We're going to be working with both the committee and in  
25 particular the trustees to try to make sure that when we do get

1 to this hearing everybody's working together -- on the  
2 assumption that there hasn't been some sort of a major  
3 schism -- that everybody's working together to make sure that  
4 we get all of the issues that need to be resolved, for which  
5 then we'll ask the Court for appropriate findings of fact. So  
6 that's what I was referring to earlier.

7 One last thing, Judge. And I think just to echo what  
8 Mr. Eckstein was saying in terms of what's likely to happen,  
9 and then what happens if the likely doesn't happen. In terms  
10 of what's likely to happen, you were asking what if no trusts  
11 opt in. Again, Judge, we are hopeful. We are hopeful that  
12 having the number of institutional investors with respect to  
13 the amount of debt that they hold providing their views in  
14 writing to the trustees will lead the trustees to not end up  
15 with no trust opting in. But to answer your question --

16 THE COURT: It was just a hypothetical question.

17 MR. PRINCI: But if no trusts opt in, Judge, then what  
18 we'll have, fortunately by virtue of this we'll have had the  
19 sale at least go forward, so we'll have a lot of proceeds in  
20 this estate. But we'll have a freefall when it comes to claims  
21 resolution, and we'll deal with it accordingly.

22 THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else have anything else  
23 they want to add?

24 All right. We're adjourned. Thank you very much,  
25 everybody.

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

68

1 MR. PRINCI: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 Your Honor, one housekeeping item. I'm sorry.

3 THE COURT: Yes.

4 MR. PRINCI: We'll be submitting to you, Your Honor,  
5 tomorrow, after we have a chance just to consult with  
6 everybody, a revised form of order that will change the title.  
7 And then we'll also send a disc down accordingly, Judge.

8 THE COURT: Thank you very much.

9 MR. PRINCI: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: All right.

11 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 4:36 PM)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Penina Wolicki, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

*Penina Wolicki*

---

PENINA WOLICKI

AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET\*\*D-569

eScribers

700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607

New York, NY 10040

Date: July 31, 2012